









*Possibilities and Difficulties of Reunion.*

---

A REVIEW

OF

DR. PUSEY'S EIRENICON.

BY

WILLIAM LOCKHART, B.A. OXON.

PRIEST OF THE DIOCESE OF WESTMINSTER.

SECOND EDITION, WITH A PREFACE &c.

LONDON :

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

1866.

*Price Two Shillings.*



21  
*Possibilities and Difficulties of Reunion.*

---

A REVIEW  
OF  
DR. PUSEY'S EIRENICON.

BY  
WILLIAM LOCKHART, B.A. OXON

PRIEST OF THE DIOCESE OF WESTMINSTER.

*SECOND EDITION, WITH A PREFACE &c.*

LONDON:  
LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.  
1866.

LONDON

PRINTED BY SPOTTISWOODE AND CO.

NEW STREET SQUARE



TO

JOHN HENRY NEWMAN, D.D.

AND

EDWARD BOUVERIE PUSEY, D.D.

TWO VENERABLE AND BELOVED NAMES

THAT ONE LOVES IN THOUGHT TO ASSOCIATE TOGETHER.

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY

ASTOR LENOX TILDEN FOUNDATION

500 N. 5TH ST. NEW YORK, N. Y.

1911

# PREFACE

TO

## THE SECOND EDITION.

---

THE FOLLOWING REVIEW contains the substance of two papers which originally appeared in the 'Weekly Register,' and were afterwards reprinted.

The first of the two letters from Dr. Pusey, which will be found in the Appendix, was addressed to that journal after the appearance of the earlier portion of the 'Review,' which accounts for the subsequent references to it.

In putting out a second edition of my 'Review,' I wish to deprecate the charge of presumption that might be brought against me, if it were supposed that I had ventured on untrodden ground in the favourable view I have formed of the possibility or even reality of some kind of corporate movement towards reunion in the Anglican Church.

In nothing that I have said do I think that I have gone beyond that beaten track, in which I have

intended only to follow the footsteps of our late venerated Cardinal Archbishop, in his memorable Letter to Lord Shrewsbury, written more than twenty years ago, the principles of which I have good reasons to know he never retracted.

In 1841, six months after the appearance of Tract 90, he speaks of ‘the facilities for the reunion of England to the Catholic Church beyond what have before existed.’ Further on he declares that ‘no one who has the means of judging can doubt that the feelings which have been expressed in favour of a return to unity by the Anglican Church are every day widely spreading and deeply sinking.’ Again : ‘The sooner an end be put to the present painful position of the Anglican Church with relation to the rest of the world the better. We may depend upon a willing, an able, and a most zealous cooperation with any effort we may make towards bringing her into her rightful position in Catholic unity with Holy See and the Churches of its obedience ; in other words, with the Church Catholic. Is this a visionary idea ? Is it merely the expression of a strong desire ? I know that many will so judge it ; perhaps *were I to consult my own quiet, I would not venture to express it.* But I will with simplicity of heart cling to hopefulness, cheered, as I feel it, by

so many promising appearances. . . . The return of this country, through its Established Church, to Catholic unity, would put an end to religious dissent and interior feud, I feel no doubt.'

Such were the late Cardinal's views on the possibilities of the Anglican movement twenty-five years ago, and he was not discouraged on account of the obvious difficulties which would have to be overcome. He continues: 'The enemy of good will not allow an end to be put to dissensions and disunion without strong and repeated efforts to prevent it. . . . In addition to this, there will be sincere scruples about particular practices, unwillingness to surrender certain forms, complicated questions of hierarchical arrangements, orders, clerical discipline, and many others which it is needless to anticipate, because they will soon enough show themselves.'

In all that I have written, I feel sure that I have not only not exceeded but have kept far within the limits which the Cardinal allowed himself. I am not half as sanguine that now, in 1866, the Established Church is moving towards the centre of unity as his Eminence was in 1841, notwithstanding that the Catholic movement within the Establishment is so much more pronounced, and so much more widely spread, than when he wrote twenty-five years ago.

Of course, no one can say for certain that the Anglican establishment, as a corporate body, may not eventually be drawn into the movement. If this were to take place, it would be hardly more wonderful than the doctrinal advance that has been made in the Anglican body during the past twenty years. A great deal may depend on political events, and on the kind of bishops that the chief minister of the Crown may be willing, and may venture, to nominate. I think, however, that he would be a bold prophet who would predict from any signs now discoverable, that such an event is advancing on our horizon.

What I do think all must discern is, that everywhere throughout the Anglican Church and its colonial offshoots there is a movement tending to the disintegration of the National Church, and of Anglicanism, as a combination of elements which of their nature cannot amalgamate, and which cannot remain together in solution, when once they have passed into a condition of activity. I cannot help thinking, however, that within the seething mass of Anglicanism there may exist elements for new combinations, and that not improbably a Free Church of England may be elaborated, in which great numbers of earnest minds may find a temporary home ; those,

namely, who though deeply possessed with a love of revealed truth, and holding in theory the principle of all dogma in a belief in the infallible authority of the Church, have not as yet come to see that the whole edifice of revealed truth was made by our Lord to hold together and rest on him, who received for himself and his successors the name and office of the Rock, or immovable basis on which that Church was founded, which is itself 'the pillar and ground of the truth.'

It has, then, been my desire to guide myself in what I have written on the possibility of corporate reunion, by principles which have been laid down by one who was a great light in the Church of our age, who was large-minded, large-hearted, and far-seeing, if sometimes in his ardent charity he may perhaps have been too sanguine of immediate results. That I have done justice to the meaning of my author in my 'Review' of the 'Eirenicon,' I have his own express testimony, and that I have done this, though in a cordial spirit, yet without saying anything *male sonans*, I think I may conclude from the words of the learned writer in the 'Études Religieuses' (the organ of the French Jesuits), in which he feels justified in calling my 'Review' a *chef d'œuvre*—words which I am not vain enough to think appropriate, except inasmuch as

they must at least imply that I have expressed myself not unbecomingly on open questions, and have written nothing ‘*offensive to pious ears.*’

I believe it has been felt by some, for whose opinion I entertain great reverence, that the line I have taken in dwelling on the possibility of a corporate movement towards reunion is mistaken if not mischievous at the present day, as tending to divert the minds of Anglicans who have strong misgivings on the tenability of their position from boldly confronting this question, and as fostering a delusion, as if the Church could ever recede from any principle for the sake of unity. I think I have said enough on these subjects in my ‘Review,’ which I need not here repeat, but to obviate misunderstanding, I wish, in the first place, to express my conviction that the author of the ‘Eirenicon,’ and those who think with him, have not thus far advanced beyond what is called the ‘branch theory’ of the Church—a theory which they could not retain either as individuals or as a body on entering Catholic communion, so that there is no question at present of individual submission. Supposing, however, that they hold this theory conscientiously, it is one on which they may also hold almost every Catholic doctrine, except that of the Divine authority of the Holy See ; but there is surely reason to hope that as dogmatic truth de-



velopes in their minds, and is operative on their lives, they will in the same proportion be drawn towards the Rock of Peter, whether as individuals or as a body, as men drink of the waters of a river of which they trace the stream until they reach its source high up in the primeval rock.

Hence, it appears to me that while the authorities of the Church are bound to hold forth no delusive hopes, and have simply to enunciate in an unmistakable way the terms of Catholic communion, which are incompatible with the theory of branch churches, this by no means excludes such expressions of private opinion as I have ventured on, as to the possible workings of this very theory under the pressure of the present circumstances of Anglicanism, into such a view of the Church as might serve for a basis of negotiations for reunion. For there can be, I conceive, no question that should it ever happen that any large number of Anglicans were to come forward as a body declaring that they were ready to accept, in some sense recognised among us, the Catholic doctrine of the Church and its Head, our authorities would be disposed to meet such a body on the principle that reunion on any terms which the Holy See could allow would be better than perpetuated schism.

To Catholics who are such, because they know

and submit to the infallible teaching of the Visible Church, it is no doubt a difficulty to understand the position of advanced Anglicans, which seems to them so illogical ; but the order of ideas is one thing, the order of facts is another, and if we who are converts will look back on our past religious history, we shall, I believe, generally find that we accepted each Catholic doctrine gradually and by itself, and last of all came to the belief in the Church and its Head on which all really depends. The same process of thought seems going on amongst Anglicans as a body. When sincere minds have arrived at a certain point, submission becomes an imperative duty, and when large numbers of minds are acting and reacting on one another in the same direction, and in the same order of ideas, I do not see why the result should not be the submission of a body. This is what I mean by a corporate movement. Whether that movement shall end in the submission of individuals as so many separate units, or of those individuals as an aggregate body, will depend on a number of circumstances. But there can be no question of the importance of such a corporate union, if we admit its possibility, and this for many reasons, especially since there will always be vast numbers of minds that would go with the crowd who would not

have sufficient self-reliance or clearness of conviction to go alone.

It may, indeed, be argued, that, supposing such a movement to be going on, there will always be some individuals whose ideas are in advance of their contemporaries, which is only saying that there must be leaders to every party, and that these persons would possibly be endangering their own souls while they were waiting to bring others on. To this I would reply, that conviction is a thing of gradual growth, made up of many indefinable influences; of this Dr. Newman's history of his own mind in the 'Apologia' is an example. It seldom happens that a man rises a sound Anglican in the morning and goes to bed a no less sound Catholic. It is true that a hundred influences adverse to Divine grace are always at work around us, but I cannot believe that any sincere man would be permitted to be so influenced by the connections of party as to make shipwreck of duty and of faith, as it were, at the very entrance of the harbour; but, supposing such a case possible, I more than doubt if all which could be said about the duty of individual submission to known truth would have the effect of preventing so great an evil. Holding, then, as I do with the late Cardinal, that a great corporate movement is actually

going on, and that corporate reunion is a possibility, I am making no new suggestion in speaking of it, but am only discussing contingencies which must be as clearly before the minds of Anglicans as before my own. Neither am I in any way answerable for the possible misuse which individuals here and there may make of my words. The mercy of God to sinners is a great truth, but some may (and doubtless do) pervert this doctrine to their own destruction. And so the corporate reunion of the Anglican Church may be the will of God, and yet there may be some who have come or may come to a point of conviction where individual submission is their plain duty, a necessary sacrifice to the exigence of truth.

Meanwhile, one can hardly fail to recognise a manifest providence in the phenomena which we at present witness, of large numbers of Anglicans, whom it would be gross uncharity to pronounce insincere, being led on step by step till they come to accept almost every Catholic doctrine, and yet not coming, as it would appear, till at the last to realise that one doctrine of the Divine authority of the Holy See, which when once accepted would make their position one of formal or conscious schism. For it is surely obvious that the leaders of

the party, as long as they remain where they are in *good faith*, are doing a work which humanly speaking could be done in no other way. Fully believing in their own priesthood, they are teaching by learned and devout writings, and from the pulpits of the Anglican Church, and with all the prestige of their position, nearly every Catholic doctrine, and celebrating what they believe to be the Mass with all the externals of Catholic ritual, and multitudes are learning from them what on account of early prejudice they would not accept from our lips, even if we had the means and opportunity of reaching them.

As for the terms of communion, I suppose there is no question of any other than those which have been laid down by the Council of Trent.\* To this

\* Perhaps the most remarkable feature of the movement is, that the ancient antipathy to Rome, and contented isolation, of Anglicanism, seem to have wellnigh passed away amongst the advanced school of Anglicans, and have been succeeded by deep aspirations towards the centre of unity. The *Eirenicon* itself, with its ten editions, and the reception it has met with amongst the different schools in the English Church, is one proof of this. The same is borne out by such statements as we quote from the leading High Church organ the *Christian Remembrancer*, speaking of the Thirty-nine Articles. . . . 'In the times that are coming on the Church of England, the question will arise, What service have the Articles of the Church of England ever done?

the Church is bound ; from this she cannot recede ; more than this she does not require. The dogmatic decrees of the Council being taken as the basis, there will be room for any explanations, or concessions on non-essentials, that the authorities of the Church might think it just and prudent to grant in order to render the work of reunion easier.

and what use are they at the present day ? But we venture to go a step beyond this volume (the *Eirenicon*) and boldly proclaim our opinion, that before union with Rome can be effected the Thirty-nine Articles must be wholly withdrawn. They are virtually withdrawn at the present moment.'

Again, quite lately, at a crowded meeting of the English Church Union at Willis's Rooms, on a vote of thanks to the author for his *Eirenicon*, which was afterwards carried by acclamation, an amendment was proposed, 'that the Council of Trent could not be accepted as a basis of reunion,' on which the proposer and seconder found themselves, with one other person, forming the minority. On this occasion Dr. Pusey spoke as follows. We quote from the *Guardian* of June 20, 1866 :—

Dr. Pusey (who rose amidst enthusiastic cheers) said—It would not be right at this late hour to dwell on what Mr. Gurney has stated with regard to the meaning of the *Eirenicon*. I would beg, however, to remark that he has omitted one exceedingly important word. That is the word 'explained.' (Cheers.) What I have said, what I have stated to Gallican Bishops, and what they have clearly understood, was this—that I believe the Council of Trent, whatever its look was, and our Articles, whatever their look was, could be so explained as to reconcile one with the other. (Cheers.) Of course there is a mode of explaining the Council of Trent which I could not receive ; and if it

simply went forth that this Society was committed to the *Eirenicon*, and the *Eirenicon* to reunion on the basis of the Council of Trent, it would give both a wrong explanation of the *Eirenicon*, and a wrong interpretation of the meaning of this Association. (Cheers.) When Mr. Gurney began his amendment I was very much inclined to second it. (Laughter.) The *Eirenicon* is a thick book, and there is no reason why this Society should commit itself to it. But what the amendment means is the real object of the *Eirenicon*. When I began to write it nothing was farther from my purpose of writing. It was put to me, 'You must answer this letter of Dr. Manning'—as he then was—and I undertook the task because it was laid upon me by those whom I could not refuse. When I had got through a good deal of our defence, it came suddenly to me—not from myself—'Is this all? Is it to end in this? Is there to be this continual division and separation?' And then I wrote the rest. Afterwards I went abroad in order to ascertain whether what I hoped for was a dream or whether it was reality. Of course I cannot repeat anything of which I am unable to speak. I saw various Bishops, and some that the papers did not know that I saw. (A laugh.) I saw also theologians whom the papers happily know nothing about; and I went with them through all the details of our case. I stated what our difficulties were—how we believed that they could be explained, and how we believed that they could be met. I assure you that people in England will be extremely astonished if I am able to show (as I hope soon to do) how much that is popularly supposed to be *de fide* with Roman Catholics is not *de fide* with them. (Cheers.) I will only give one instance. I saw a theologian, and one of the most eminent. We talked for two hours about the Council of Trent, and about our belief, as it is expressed by those whom we considered to be the most genuine sons of the Church of England. The result was that point after point he was satisfied; and the interview ended in his saying, 'I shall salute you as a true brother.' (Loud cheers.) As to supremacy he said, 'I do not know where it is to be found stated in what the supremacy consists.' (Cheers.)

It has been said that I have lived so much among old books that I do not know that the modern practice is very different from what I had gathered from those old books. As regards appeals to Rome, which formed so large a portion of the quarrel at the Reformation, this theologian told me that there is now scarcely such a thing known as an appeal. (Cheers.) He stated that those things which the Church of England disclaimed were no essential parts of the supremacy; and I may add that a very eminent French theologian said to me, 'If other matters are settled, the supremacy will make no difficulty.' I had spoken to him just the same words as have been quoted, only the emphasis was not laid on the words 'in itself'—that is, 'the consequences which it involves.' He left me, saying, 'This does not touch our consciences; if other matters were settled, the question of the supremacy could be easily arranged by a *concordat*.' As to our Bishops, he said they might be named in any mode which had ever been known to the Church—they might be named even by Queen Victoria, though she was a Protestant. And the person who said this was an authority of no common weight. (Loud cheers.)



A REVIEW  
OF  
DR. PUSEY'S EIRENICON.

---

*The Church of England a Portion of Christ's Holy Catholic Church, and a Means of Restoring Visible Unity: an Eirenicon.* In a Letter to the Author of 'The Christian Year.' By E. B. PUSEY, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford. Oxford: Parker. 1865.

---

It is quite conceivable that two Catholic readers might rise from a perusal of this book with totally opposite views as to its character and aim. To one it might seem what its name implies, an olive-branch of peace, to the other a firebrand; to the one a hopeful move in the direction of faith and unity, to the other a work calculated to strengthen and perpetuate the wall of separation between Anglicans and the Catholic Church. For the work has a two-fold object indicated by its double title. It is, on the one hand, a controversial defence of the Church

of England as a portion of the visible Church ; and yet it is, on the other hand, a most distinct admission throughout of the shortcomings of Anglicanism, of its abnormal condition as separated from the centre of unity, and is, perhaps, the most unequivocal advance that has ever been made towards negotiation for healing the schism of the sixteenth century. For myself, while deploring a good deal of the controversial portion, and thinking that more intercourse with Catholics would have saved Dr. Pusey from much misunderstanding of our doctrine, yet on the whole I venture to believe that the book ought to be accepted by Catholics as an Eirenicon, according to its author's expressed intention. We make every allowance for an envoy who comes to us from the hostile camp, bearing an olive-branch in one hand, even though he carries a sword in the other ; and we do not roughly repel him, even though he claims to speak only in the name of one division of the enemy, and though his proposals are not of unconditional surrender, but of conference and negotiation.

No doubt, one might take another line, and urge the inconsistency of the Anglican position, and the special inconsistency of Dr. Pusey in remaining in the Church of England, after his declarations in 1850 and the events which have since occurred. It is, indeed, difficult to understand how he can speak of the Anglican Church as having any authoritative

voice, or being in any way a Divine teacher, or having any mind or moral personality at all. The best that can be said of it even by its ablest defenders is (to quote the words of a contemporary), 'that if it tolerates heresy, it also tolerates orthodoxy, and that its Prayer-book and formularies admit an orthodox sense.' Catholics, in fact, can see in it nothing but a mere compromise between two contending parties, bound over before the civil magistrate under heavy penalties to keep the peace and live together. This and a great deal more may be fully admitted; nevertheless, when all has been said, there remains the fact that numbers of learned and apparently earnest men do not see their inconsistency now in 1865 any more than their predecessors, the leaders of the movement twenty years ago, and who are now Catholics, saw their inconsistency in 1840.

Old Catholics who have watched both movements cannot see less reason for confidence now than formerly. They cannot see that the celebrated Gorham judgment, or any of the later decisions in the law courts, have changed the status of the Church of England. Those who could believe in the Church of England, in spite of the original establishment of the royal supremacy, are not necessarily insincere or more unreasonable, if they believe in it, in spite of the acts of that supremacy. In 1840 it was maintained by the leaders of the movement that the

Church of England, though well nigh disabled by the incubus of the supremacy, was still alive ; in 1865 their successors only maintain the same. Nor is it as the case would be, if from the time when Newman, Manning, and other leaders of the Anglican school left the English Church, the Catholic movement had come to an end, or become insignificant. On the contrary, the appearance of such a work as Dr. Pusey's, and from one in his eminent position, is only one amongst a hundred evidences, that the movement, far from having come to an end, has become broader and deeper. It cannot be denied that almost every Catholic doctrine is now preached in hundreds of Anglican pulpits—not after the tentative manner of the original Tractarian movement, but boldly and distinctly, indicating unmistakably that the leaders are conscious that they are speaking to a laity sufficiently imbued with Catholic ideas to understand and sympathise with their teachers. In nothing is this change, from the reserve then necessary to the explicitness now possible, more marked than in the restoration in so many churches of the Catholic vestments, as a natural embodiment of the unequivocal teaching of the Eucharistic Sacrifice.

It has been objected to Dr. Pusey's book that its aim is not so much the restoration of unity, as the prevention of individual conversion. It certainly may have this effect in some cases, and this may have been in part his object ; but we can hardly

blame him for doing what he would not be sincere if he did not do. The same was done by Dr. Manning and Dr. Newman, so long as they believed in the Anglican position, and would be done by any one honestly in error. Once let us admit that Dr. Pusey believes, strange and unaccountable as it may seem to us, that the Anglican position is tenable, and we shall see that he could not act differently. But what hope, it may be said, can there be of this reunion, while Anglicans sincerely hold what they do, since the Church cannot change her essential doctrine? What result can be hoped for, what course is there but that of individual conversion from error to truth, and how can corporate reunion be possible except by the conversion of each individual of the separated body? I cannot, of course, profess in a short review to answer all the difficulties that may be raised on this matter of corporate reunion; yet corporate reunion cannot be impossible, since it has been realised by the Church, at the Council of Florence, as well as in various other transactions with separated bodies. There can be no doubt that in such negotiations for reunion on the part of separatists there must always have been much that was unsatisfactory and anomalous, much previous inconsistency of statement, much of indecision and uncertainty of action.\* The history of the

\* Since the appearance of my first edition this point has been dwelt on with great force by Dr. Pusey's reviewer in the *Études Religieuses* (Feb. 1866), the organ of the French Jesuits.

Council of Florence affords an instance of this. What must have been the inconsistency of many of the Oriental Bishops, who had acted for years out of communion with Rome, and defended their position even in the Council itself, and yet afterwards submitted to all that Rome required as terms of communion? Of course I am not comparing the present informal movement in the Anglican Church with any of these, but only observing that inconsistency on the part of separatists is perhaps almost involved in the idea of negotiation for corporate reunion; and yet this has not prevented the Church from admitting such inchoate measures in the direction of unity. The failure of the Council of Florence to effect a permanent reunion is obviously no argument against the principle, or it would prove too much, namely, that the Church erred in attempting it. But if the Church attempted it, clearly the principle is sound; that it failed of success is to be attributed to the evil will of man, which has so often marred the fair purpose of God. Besides, other corporate reunions have been attempted, before and since, and have succeeded; such as that of the Armenians under Eugenius IV., and of other Oriental sects, some of which have taken place even in our own day.

To turn now to the work itself. Dr. Pusey begins his book with what he calls a personal explanation; he had wished to abstain from controversy for the remainder of his life, but his friends considered that

he was in some measure bound to reply to Archbishop Manning's published letter ; and this required something controversial in his answer. He goes on to defend himself from a charge made by the Archbishop, that in fraternising with the Low Church party in certain protests against the Rationalistic school in the Church of England, he had been 'drifting back from the old moorings.' He says : 'Ever since I knew them (which was not in my earliest years), I have loved those who are called Evangelicals ; I loved them because they loved our Lord ; I loved them for their zeal for souls. I often thought them narrow, yet I was drawn to individuals amongst them, more than to others who held truths in common with myself which the Evangelicals did not hold, at least explicitly. When occasion came, as in some of our troubles at Oxford, we acted together. . . . I have united with the Evangelicals now as I did before, whenever they would join with me in defence of our common faith. I have not united with them in any of those things which were not in accordance with my own principles. . . . And this perhaps may be an occasion to mention what relates to a very sacred season of my life when death seemed day by day nearer. Had it so pleased God that I should then die, I should have worded the confession of my faith in words like these : "I believe *explicitly* all which I know God to have revealed to His Church, and *implicitly* anything if

He has revealed it, which I know not ; in simple words, I believe all which the Church believes : this is my habit of mind now, this I confess when I say to God, ‘ I believe one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church.’ ” Dr. Pusey goes on to comment on Dr. Manning’s Letter, of which he says the real point is to assert the contradictory of the statement that ‘ the Church of England is in God’s hands the great bulwark against infidelity in this land.’ To defend this proposition is one of his principal objects throughout his book. He explains, however, the sense in which he understood the proposition to have been originally enunciated by Dr. Newman.\* He says, ‘ This saying was not mine, but that of one of the deepest thinkers and observers in the Roman Communion. It relates plainly only to a present fact ; it does not aver that the Church of England is the best possible bulwark, but only as a matter of fact that it is at this moment, in God’s Providence, a real and chief bulwark against infidelity. Of course any Roman Catholic must think that the Roman Communion, if it were of the same extent in this land as the English Church is now, would be a much stronger bulwark, but this is not the question.’ He goes on to show what has been the estimate

\* See *Dr. Newman’s Letter*, in Appendix I., in which he expresses a decided approval of the line taken in this paper. His own estimate of the *Eirenicon* has been since expressed in his Letter to Dr. Pusey.



formed of the Church of England, in its relation to Catholic doctrine and the hopes of reunion, by illustrious Catholics in other days. 'We are not in most things,' says Dupin to Archbishop Wake, 'so far removed from one another that we may not be mutually reconciled.' 'This union,' says Dr. Doyle (Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin, the celebrated 'J. K. L. '), 'is not so difficult as appears to many. It is not difficult, for in the discussions which were held on this subject, in which Archbishop Wake was engaged, as in others which were carried on between Bossuet and Leibnitz, it appeared that the points of agreement between the Churches were numerous, those on which the parties hesitated few, and apparently not the most important. The effort which was then made was not attended with success, but its failure was owing more to Princes than to Priests, more to State policy than to a difference of belief.'

The next thirty or forty pages contain an elaborate proof, drawn chiefly from the celebrated Tract 90 of Dr. Newman, that the Articles of the Church of England and the Decrees of Trent may be reconciled, and that there is nothing in the Decrees of Trent which may not be so interpreted as to form the basis of negotiation for the reunion of Anglicans to the Catholic Church. 'We have been wont,' Dr. Pusey says, 'to dwell with pleasure on the amount of faith which we confess in common with the Roman Church. In the three creeds we confess together

the whole doctrine as to the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation of our Blessed Lord ; we teach alike, the one end of man, the resurrection of the body, the judgment according to works, the life everlasting, and the everlasting fire.\*

Dr. Pusey goes on to maintain that the Anglican Church teaches with the Catholic Church, regeneration in baptism, confession and absolution, the Real Presence and the Eucharistic Sacrifice, and has the same doctrine on grace and justification. The substance of a great deal which follows is, that, according to the view of the learned writer, there is nothing in the formal statements of the Church of England, in her Prayer-book, articles, and homilies, which cannot be reconciled with the formal statements of the Catholic Church.

On the question of the Church's unity Dr. Pusey would hold an opinion differing, on important points, from the doctrine universally held by Catholics ; *and here we fear would be the chief difficulty in discovering a common basis for negotiation.* He would look upon the Church as indissolubly one, by reason of a Sacramental bond of union, established between our Lord and all those who hold a right faith concerning Him, through the instrumentality of a rightly-ordained Priesthood. He appears to hold, that

\* Dr. Pusey's view on this point is remarkably borne out by an able and candid writer in the (Dissenting) *British Quarterly* for April 1866.

visible unity under one Head, and that Head the Bishop of Rome, is not only desirable, but according to the will and intention of our Lord; that any breach of this unity could not take place without sin, but that there may be such a thing as justifiable or material schism; and he would consider the separation of England from the Chair of Peter to be something of this nature. He writes: 'This unity, derived from our Blessed Lord as Head of the Church, is imparted primarily through the Sacraments.' 'All that were baptised into Christ have put on Christ, and having put Him on are one in Christ; all in the Holy Eucharist are one bread and one body who are partakers of that one Bread.' 'Unknown in face, in place separate, different in language, opposed, alas! in some things to one another, still before the throne of God they are One Holy Catholic Apostolic Church.' 'This,' he continues, 'is sometimes called objective unity;' and this Divine gift requires, as a corresponding duty, what has been called 'subjective unity,' or a 'unison of wills;' and of this intercommunion is the natural expression. But is all unity forfeited where the unity of intercommunion is suspended? No one in the face of Church history can or does maintain, that all interruptions of intercommunion destroy unity. In the second century, 'the East,' says Epiphanius, 'differing from the West, they received not from each other tokens of peace.' In the next century was a temporary

severance between Rome and both Asiatic and African Churches, through the Bishop of Rome, concerning whom St. Firmilian says: 'While thinking that all may be excommunicated by him, he excommunicated himself alone from all.' 'St. Meletius, of Antioch, though out of communion with Rome, presided at the second General Council, and after his death was owned to be a Saint by those who, in his lifetime, owned him not to be a Bishop.' The fifth General Council was the occasion of a schism which rent the West, Africa, Upper Italy, from East to West, and even Ireland; nor was the schism wholly healed for a hundred and fifty years.

Such appears to be a very fair statement of the Anglican theory of the Church's unity. It is given here without comment, as a clear expression of what learned Anglicans think they have to say for their position. And for the same reason a careful perusal of the whole work may be recommended to those whose duty it is to be ready to answer difficulties. I do not recommend it to any but learned Catholics. As it is the work of one who has made Church history and the writings of the Holy Fathers the study of a lifetime, the controversial portion, based chiefly on the *writer's view* of the Patristic teaching, may easily present difficulties which an unlearned reader may not be able to answer. The Catholic theologian, who studies the Holy Fathers and historians of the early centuries, has a clue to

guide him, in the perpetual unbroken tradition of the living Church, which is altogether wanting to the Anglican student, however learned. Anglicans study the Fathers much as the ordinary Protestant studies Holy Scripture ; without the clue they wander hither and thither through a labyrinth, disappointed and baffled at every turn ; or, after seeming to have found the road, they may chance to discover that the shortest course is to retrace their steps and begin again.

The historical difficulties started by Dr. Pusey are well known to all who have at all studied the relation of the See of Rome to the other Churches. Such anomalies, even if more than apparent, make no way against the whole current of Patristic teaching running in the other direction ; but probably, if we could get at all the facts of the case, the difficulty in each instance would disappear. The case of Meletius, for example, presents a very different view from that given in the 'Eirenicon,' as we find it stated by Socrates, who wrote in the next century, and whose account must be familiar to Dr. Pusey. It seems that the case of St. Meletius was one of a disputed succession such as occurred at different times in the line of the Roman Pontiffs, depending chiefly on some disputed question of fact, when Catholics and even Saints took opposite sides. Meletius had been chosen Bishop by the Arian majority in Antioch. After his election he gradually declared himself

Catholic, and a large body of Arians conformed to the Catholic faith adhering to Meletius, while the Arian party rejected him. Paulinus was soon after chosen and consecrated Bishop by the old Catholic party, who would have nothing to do with Meletius because he had been elected by the votes of the Arians. Rome and the West, on such evidence as reached them, adhered to the side of Paulinus, and did not acknowledge Meletius. Socrates, however, informs us that a mutual understanding was come to between the two parties, that both Bishops should rule each over his own congregation, and that on the death of either the survivor should be recognised as sole Bishop. He tells us that this put an end to the dispute, and there was no longer any division amongst the people.\* This happened a year or more before the Council of Constantinople, at which Meletius presided, and during the sitting of which he died. It is, then, hard to see on what grounds Dr. Pusey makes the assertion that Meletius presided at the Council and died while out of communion with Rome, whereas Socrates tells us that the dispute or schism was at an end at least a year before the Council. There does not appear to be any evidence which makes it clear that he was ever out of communion with Rome at all. On the other hand, it is certain that Meletius communicated with Bishops with whom Rome was in full communion, such as

\* Socr. *Eccl. Hist.* v. 5.

St. Basil, St. Cyril, St. Gregory Nazianzen, St. Chrysostom, as well as the whole Council of Constantinople; and this could not have been, had he been considered by them, or by Rome, as out of communion, since it is notorious that to communicate with those who were out of communion was always held as *ipso facto* involving excommunication.\*

The next proposition sounds strangely paradoxical. 'The English Church has not rejected a visible head, and is not more independent of Rome than Africa was in the time of St. Augustine.'

One would be very glad to hear this, if one could see any sense in which it could be true; but where is the proof of it? Probably it will astonish most of Dr. Pusey's Anglican readers even more than it surprises us. He shows, indeed, clearly enough that St. Augustine denounced in very strong language the carrying appeals to Rome in cases which by the Canons were to be decided before local synods. 'If presbyters, deacons, and other inferior Clergy (he quotes from St. Augustine) shall in any cause which they have, complain of the judgment of their own Bishops, let the neighbouring Bishops hear and determine the matter between them, being called in by them, with consent of their own Bishops. But if they think that they should appeal from these too, let them not appeal to courts beyond the seas, but either to the Primates of their

\* Appendix II. Note A.

Province, or to a General Council of Africa, as has often been enacted about Bishops also. But if any one choose to appeal to the parts beyond the seas, let him be received to communion by no one in Africa,'

Dr. Pusey adds, 'The English Church in the 15th century acquiesced in, or consented to, the suppression of appeals to Rome. The African Church in the 5th century not only forbade them, but excommunicated any one who should so appeal.' Yet Dr. Pusey would not deny that St. Augustine in his writings furnishes a link of that long chain of tradition which runs through all Patristic teaching, in regard to the prerogatives of the Apostolic See, and the Chair of Peter. St. Augustine himself, in the case of Pelagius, sends to the Pope the decrees of two African Synods, by which he had been condemned. Pope Innocent, in reply, affirms the rights of his See in the strongest language. St. Augustine in his letter on the subject writes of the Pope, 'He hath answered to all as was right, and as it became the Prelate of the Apostolic See. Already the decrees of two Councils on this matter have been sent to the Apostolic See, from whence the rescripts have been received. The cause is terminated.' Again, in his 43rd Epistle, he speaks of the 'Roman Church in which hath always flourished the Primacy of the Apostolic Chair, "*Apostolicæ Cathedræ Principatus*."' Dr. Pusey speaks as if the question of appeals



covered the whole case of the Papal claims. It is clear that St. Augustine was of a different opinion, and did not intend, while protesting against certain abuses in matters of appeal, to detract from that authority to which he himself appealed as to the highest and last tribunal in matters of doctrine; for certainly this seems to be the natural sense of the memorable words ‘*Apostolicæ Cathedræ Principatus,*’ and ‘*inde recepta sunt rescripta, causa finita est.*’ And surely this restraining of uncanonical appeals to Rome is a very different thing from the formal declaration required of all the Anglican Clergy, that ‘the Pope hath no jurisdiction in this realm of England.’

Dr. Pusey quotes a devout and loyal Catholic like Gerson, speaking strong words against abuses of Papal authority; but we may be sure Gerson, who had been the great light at the Councils of Basle and Constance, would have died rather than have impugned that Primacy of jurisdiction in the See of Peter which a few years later the Council of Florence declared to be of Divine institution. Gerson’s words are these, as quoted by Dr. Pusey: ‘A General Council, representing the Universal Church, if it aim to see complete union, to repress and put an end to schisms, and to exalt the Church, must before all things, after the manner of the Holy Fathers before us, limit and bound the co-active and usurped power of the Pope, which at successive times many supreme Pontiffs obtained to themselves,

contrary to God and justice, depriving inferior Bishops of the power and authority given them by God and the Church.' Nothing that Dr. Pusey brings forward is much stronger against abuse of authority by the See of Rome than the words he quotes of Pope Nicholas V., who certainly did not intend to repudiate that jurisdiction of the Holy See which is of Divine right, but only to admit that Popes being human may abuse and have abused the authority committed to them by God for edification. The words of Pope Nicholas, as given by Dr Pusey, are : 'The Roman Pontiffs, it seems to me, extended their skirts too far, in that they left no jurisdiction to the other Bishops ; those of Basle abridged too much the power of the Apostolic See ; but so it happens, whoso doth things unworthy must endure things unjust, those who would set erect a tree inclined on one side, draw it on the other. Our mind is, not to despoil of their rights the Bishops who are called to a part of our charge, for so we hope to preserve our own jurisdiction, if we do not usurp what belongs to others.' If Anglicans will accept that Primacy of jurisdiction given by our Lord to Peter, which St. Augustine recognised in his successor, and which was afterwards defined and accepted by East and West at the Council of Florence, the limits of that jurisdiction can easily be settled, and the line drawn between what is Divine and what of ecclesiastical institution, in the actual jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiffs. The separation between Eng-

land and the Church took place and is perpetuated, not merely because appeals to Rome were abolished, but because all that was of Divine and all that was of human origin, in the jurisdiction of the Pope, was rejected together, and is rejected still in the oath of supremacy ; and also because essential changes, of a character no less heretical than schismatic, were introduced or accepted by the Church of England. Such, for instance, was the repudiation of the Sacrament of Extreme Unction from the Service Book, and that tampering with the Liturgy which has obscured, to say the least, if it has not absolutely excluded, the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. To these and other such acts the Church of England stands committed, so long as she retains her present Service Book ; and until such acts are repented and retracted, it seems almost idle to speak of hopes for reunion. But where so much advance has been made in the right direction, we must hope that the rest of the way will ere long be traversed.

The greater part of the remainder of the volume is taken up with proving what most Catholics would be quite ready to admit, that many exaggerated things have been said by Catholic writers of name, concerning the Pope's personal infallibility, on the prerogatives of the Blessed Virgin, and on many other subjects. No doubt, viewed from without, there is much matter for perplexity in this whole subject. We know that many persons, now Catho-

lics, have been for years kept back from seeing the Church's claims on their absolute allegiance, because of the hold these exaggerated statements had obtained on their imagination, and the repugnance they felt in themselves to the aspect of doctrine thus presented. This has arisen partly from their having attributed to such statements an authority which they did not really possess, and from their not distinguishing between matters of faith and matters of pious opinion ; partly also because they did not make allowance for the exaggeration of rhetorical statements and the use of words in the second intention. Catholics, on the other hand, especially those who have been always Catholics, are not much troubled at these things. They know that the Church while requiring *unitas in necessariis* is most free in conceding *libertas in dubiis*, that there are schools of opinion in the Church, that great latitude is permitted in the unauthoritative expression of devotional sentiment, and that almost any amount of bad taste is tolerated ; in a word, that the Church does not aim at creating a dead and soulless level of uniformity, but tolerates great liberty in matters of opinion, provided her children accept her as their Mother and Mistress in Divine Truth, and are always ready to submit to her decision, should she, through her legitimate organs, think fit to pronounce a judgment. Thus she secures to her children the habit of faith and obedience, and the right exercise of their reason and free will.

And so Catholics learn from the Church a large spirit of forbearance and toleration, and put up with the views of others which do not involve a difference of faith, expecting a like forbearance in return.

As for exaggeration of statement, it is the tendency of the human mind to exaggerate; because our judgments are influenced at least as much by the sensitive as by the intellectual part of our being. We speak from what we feel, quite as much as from what we know. And so, when we have to oppose error or defend truth, the more we feel the greatness of the truth, the more difficult do we find it not to overstate what we mean. Moreover, feeling the inadequacy of human language to express all we feel and know, we almost inevitably fall into exaggerations, trusting to other statements, made elsewhere or on other occasions, to qualify our expressions and prevent a misconception of our meaning. Thus, for example, no one has made more of the intercession of Mary than St. Bernard, yet no one has shown more clearly than the sainted author of the 'Jesu dulcis memoria,' that Jesus was his all in all, or could have said more absolutely—

Simply to His grace, and wholly,  
Life and light and strength belong,  
And I love supremely, solely,  
Him the Holy, Him the strong.\*

Much the same may be said in behalf of St. Liguori.

\* Newman's *Gerontius*.

If Dr. Pusey were a Catholic, or were well acquainted with the practical working of the Catholic religion in the lives of pious Catholics, he might not, indeed, approve of all that was done or said amongst them, but he would acquit them of taking from our Lord any of the love they gave to His Mother, and provided he accepted the statement of the Council of Trent that 'the Saints reigning with Christ intercede for us, and that it is good for us to invoke them,' he would find himself left pretty free as to the devotional expression of this belief.

But it is a wonderful advance on the usual forms of Protestant controversy, when we find these subjects treated, not with the exaggeration of the vulgar controversialist, but with the calmness and precision of the theologian, however much his position outside the Church may necessarily distort his view, as a painting can never be seen properly except from the right point of sight. It is a great consolation, and opens a new phase of the controversy, to find a writer in the position of Dr. Pusey, after expressing himself most strongly against what he calls exaggerations in 'the practical Roman system,' concluding that 'the breach with Rome has been widened unduly,' and again that 'Rome need not make such things terms of communion, nor need she insist that the Church of England, if united with her, should receive them, but provision might be made formally, on both sides, that she need not.'

Again, 'I doubt not that the Roman Church and ourselves are kept apart much more by that vast practical system which lies beyond the letter of the Council of Trent, things which are taught with a *quasi* authority in the Roman Church, than by what is actually defined.' He then goes on, strangely enough, to draw a distinction between those who are born Roman Catholics, 'who have a liberty,' and converts, who, he says, 'in the nature of things,' cannot have the liberty, of choosing what opinions and practices to adopt on open questions, and adds: 'For myself I have always felt that had the English Church, by accepting heresy, driven me out, I could have gone in no other way than that of closing my eyes and accepting whatever was put before me; but a liberty which individuals could not use, and explanations which, so long as they remained individual, must be unauthoritative, might be formally made by the Church of Rome to the Church of England as the basis of reunion.' Further on he says: 'If Englishmen speak against Papal authority it is not in itself (which would be a matter of indifference), but as an authority which, if they submitted to it, would enforce upon them that practical system. Probably, too, there is an hereditary dread of the renewal of the fires of Smithfield, the sinfulness of which has never been disowned.' Speaking of his hopes for the unity of Christendom, he says: 'Years ago we seemed to be in the position of the

Heaven-controlled seer : " I see him, but not nigh ; I behold him, but not now." And meanwhile our office was within ourselves ; we could not propose union, while we ourselves were so disunited. I hoped that the passing storm of unbelief, which I have seen in the distance these forty years, would drive together those who loved Jesus. I hoped that as we became united in the truth, and in the characteristic principles of our Church, those other great portions of the Church, East and West, would see that God is in us of a truth. Why should not the Church again be united in that faith which she held before a miserable quarrel first caused disunion ? . . . . Apart from other evils, the strength is wasted against each other, which should be concentrated against the common foe of Jesus, and of all who are His. The organic reunion of Christendom, and of the Protestant bodies too, has been held to be possible even by the Ultramontanes in the Roman Church. Cardinal Wiseman quoted, nearly a quarter of a century ago, the expressions of " the profound and pious Mohler." " After observing," he says, " that no Catholic can refuse to acknowledge with humiliation the corruptions of past ages, that the proof of this lies in the very existence of Protestantism, which could not have existed without them, he thus concludes : ' Behold the ground on which the two Churches will one day meet and clasp hands. In the consciousness of our common fault let us cry out to one



another, one and all, "We have all erred ; the Church alone could not fail. We have all sinned ; the Church alone is pure from stain." ' Again, Dr. Pusey quotes the words of the Count de Maistre. The extract is from Gladstone's Remarks on the Royal Supremacy, and this Catholic writer is quoted by him as belonging to 'the strictest sect of the Ultramontane school.' 'If ever Christians are to be brought together, as everything invites them, it seems that the movement should take its beginning from the Church of England . . . . the Church of England, which touches us with one hand, touches with the other those whom we cannot touch. And though in a certain point of view . . . . it presents the ridiculous spectacle of a rebel preaching obedience, yet in another aspect, it is *most precious*, and may be considered, like some chemical medium, capable of uniting together elements which, of their own nature, cannot amalgamate.' 'It is now sixty years,' Mr. Gladstone continues, in the extract given by Dr. Pusey, 'since thus a stranger and an alien, a stickler to the extremest point for the prerogatives of his Church, and nursed in every prepossession against us, turning his eye across the channel, although he could then only see the English Church in the lethargy of her organization and the dull twilight of her learning, could nevertheless discern that there was a very special work written of God for her in Heaven, and that she was VERY PRECIOUS

to the Christian world. O, how serious a rebuke to those who, not strangers but suckled at her breast, . . . have written concerning her even as men might write that were hired to make a case against her, and by an adverse instinct in the selection of evidence, and a severity of construction such as no history of the deeds of man can bear, have often in these last years put her to an open shame.'

Dr. Pusey refers to the Association for the Unity of Christendom with great hopefulness. 'And now,' he says, 'God seems again to be awakening the yearning to be visibly one, and He who alone, the Author of Peace and Lover of Concord, must have put it into men's minds to pray for the unity of Christendom, will in His time, we trust, fulfil the prayer which He Himself has taught.'

Dr. Pusey's conclusion is a strong protest against what he terms 'the present theory of Papal infallibility.' 'The Ultramontanes in the Roman Communion seem to be drifting off further from the principles of the early and undivided Church. . . . The shores of Italy seem ever to be receding. . . . In the Gallican Church a century and a half ago there seemed to be a dawn of reunion. Now things seem to be taking an opposite direction.' He concludes by saying that to those who would hold the opinions of Bossuet, he and those who would act with him, 'stretch forth their hands.' 'The strife with unbelief

stretches and strains the powers of the Church everywhere ; Satan's armies are united, at least, in their warfare against the truth as it is in Jesus. Are those who would maintain the faith in Him alone to be at variance? On the terms which Bossuet, we hope, would have sanctioned, we long to see the Church united ; to all who in East or West desire to see intercommunion restored among those who hold the faith of the undivided Church, we say, " This is not our longing only ; this is impressed on our Liturgy by those who were before us ; for this, whenever we celebrate the Holy Eucharist, we are bound to pray, that God would inspire continually the Universal Church with the spirit of truth, unity, and concord." For this I pray daily. For this I would gladly die. " O Lord, tarry not." "

Such is the conclusion of this remarkable book. It has been my endeavour to let the author, as far as possible, speak for himself : to present his mind to my readers ; not to refute, still less to accept his arguments. The book certainly requires an answer ; but I cannot help my strong impression, that the best answer to it will come one day from Dr. Pusey himself. I mean, of course, in as far as it impugns any Catholic dogma—for on all the rest Dr. Pusey might retain his opinions, if he and those who think with him were members of the Roman obedience. A great aid towards this consummation would be a disposition on our side to explain, and to receive explanations,

in a conciliatory spirit. The book unquestionably is a most clearly pronounced endeavour to find a basis for reunion, on the principles debated between Archbishop Wake and the Gallican divines two centuries ago.\* And here two questions arise. First, how far is Dr. Pusey authorised to speak in the name of the Church of England, or backed by any large body of the clergy and laity, headed by any minority however small of the Bishops? The second question is, how far the authorities of the Catholic Church would be ready at this day to accept such advances if they were really made? To the first of these questions this is not the place to offer an answer. The only satisfactory reply must soon appear, in the mode in which the book is received in the Church of England. To the second I would desire to reply with great diffidence. But it is not going beyond what we have been accustomed to read in approved theologians, and to receive from the lips and pen of our own Bishops, if we answer, that such advances, if made by any large bodies of separatists, would be met by our authorities in a conciliatory spirit; † and that, for the healing of a schism, any lawful concessions would be gladly made. Even those who most strongly hold

\* It has been suggested in some quarters that Wake's real object was to detach the French Church from communion with Rome. Such is certainly not the sense of Dr. Pusey's reference to him, for when Archdeacon Wordsworth propounded that view in the *Guardian* he at once wrote to contradict it.

† Cardinal Wiseman's *Letter to Lord Shrewsbury*.

that what are commonly called the Ultramontane opinions are the more logical, the legitimate deduction from Scripture, the true development of Patristic teaching, and who would prefer a union of all Christians on this basis, would nevertheless hold most strongly that *reunion on the principles of Bossuet would be better than perpetuated schism*. Whether such negotiations may ever actually take place, or how it may please God to direct the issue, no man can pretend to foresee. It *may* not be God's way of mercy for England, but we may not dare to say that it *cannot* be. Meanwhile, we may well look hopefully on any movement tending in that direction. To all Anglicans who hold with Dr. Pusey, and would that we had reason to think that he represents the great body of his Church, we would say from our hearts—God speed. And because the mighty changes in minds and wills that must take place before such a consummation can be possible, must be simply the effect of grace, and the fruit of prayer, therefore placing our whole confidence in sincere and united prayer, must we hail it as the most hopeful sign of all, that Anglicans are themselves praying for unity. To the members of their Association of prayer for the Unity of Christendom we address ourselves, inviting them to join with us in the petition, that all the Baptized may be brought within the Fold of Visible Unity under the Successor of Peter, whom Christ the Good Shepherd hath set over His whole

Flock. It is this which we mean when we pray for the Unity of Christendom. This is the object of the constant prayer of every devout Catholic; he may ask for it specifically, as a member of some special organisation for this purpose; and no doubt it would be a great encouragement to sustained and united prayer if we should see established amongst us, with the sanction of authority, an Association of prayer for the reunion of all the Baptized within the Visible Fold of Christ. Such Associations have indeed from time to time been set upon by zealous and fervent servants of God, like the late Father Ignatius Spencer and others, but we fear they have too generally languished after a time, and need now to be resuscitated by an apostolic zeal directed by authority.\* But, without any such organisation, the prayer for unity goes up continually to the throne of God; it is implied each time that we say 'Thy Kingdom come' in the 'Our Father,' and is prayed for expressly by each Priest when standing daily before the Altar he recites the prayer before Communion for the Peace and Unity of the One and Indivisible Church of God.

While admitting that it is fairly open to Catholic readers to form a different estimate of Dr. Pusey's already celebrated 'Eirenicon,' I have distinctly indicated that my own view is favourable to it, as a whole, understanding its main drift to be a seeking after unity, and not after pretexts for division. It has, in fact,

\* Appendix. Note B.

appeared to me the most unequivocal advance in that direction made since the Reformation, being a clearly pronounced endeavour to find a basis for reunion in what are commonly known as the principles of the Gallican Divines. This estimate of the work receives a strong confirmation from Dr. Pusey's Letter to the *Weekly Register* of November 25, 1865. If it be true that an honest man is the best interpreter of his own meaning—and few will deny that Dr. Pusey is an *honest* man—then it is clear that I have not misconceived the true sense of the 'Eirenicon.' He writes, 'I thank you with all my heart for your kind-hearted and appreciative review of my "Eirenicon." I am thankful that you have brought out the main drift and object of it, *that which, in my mind, underlies the whole*, to show that, in my conviction, there is no insurmountable obstacle to the union of the Roman, Greek, and Anglican communions. I have long been convinced that *there is nothing in the Council of Trent which could not be explained satisfactorily to us* if it were explained *authoritatively*, i.e. by the Roman Church herself, not by individual theologians only;' and again, 'I thank you for that tenderness which enabled you to see my aim and objects throughout a long and necessarily miscellaneous work.' He then goes on to say that whatever there was controversial in his book he had said only on 'the defensive, not as a reformer;' and again, 'I do not presume to prescribe to Italians

or Spaniards what they shall hold, or how they shall express their *pious opinions*, and least of all did I think of imputing to any of the writers whom I quoted ' (such as St. Bernard, St. Liguori, Faber, and others) 'that they took from our Lord any of the love which they gave to His Mother. I was intent only on describing the system which I believe is the great obstacle to reunion. I had not the least thought of criticising holy men who held it.'

On the subject of the prerogatives of the Sovereign Pontiff, Dr. Pusey expresses, not indeed the Catholic doctrine, but puts forth as his own an opinion so much beyond what we have been accustomed to hear even from advanced Anglicans, that we feel sure it will be read by most Catholics with unmixed surprise and satisfaction. 'I have not intended,' he says, 'to express any opinion about a visible head of the Church. We readily recognise the Primacy of the Bishop of Rome; the bearings of that Primacy upon other local Churches we believe to be matter of ecclesiastical, not of Divine law. But neither is there anything in the Supremacy, in itself, to which we should object.'

In another part of his letter he writes, 'I believe that the hopes which you have held out that the 'authorities of the Roman Communion might hold, "that reunion on the principles of Bossuet would be better than perpetuated schism," will unlock many a pent-up longing, pent-up on the ground of its appa-



rent hopelessness.' The concluding words of this beautiful and consoling letter are: 'If hope is revived in the English mind that Christendom may again be united, re-kindled hope will ascend in more fervent prayer to Him "who maketh men to be of one mind in an house," and our prayers will not return unheard for want of love.'

It was clearly therefore no mistake to say that Dr. Pusey's principal object was to ascertain whether a reunion of Anglicans with the Catholic Church be possible on what are commonly called Gallican principles, and that he accepts the suggestion I had ventured to throw out, that a reunion on the principles of Bossuet would be better than perpetuated schism. The gist of the whole work, then, may be fairly reduced to this single issue, and so I intend to treat it. It is right in doing so to enter somewhat more deeply into the matter in its practical bearings, and to look in the face some of the principal difficulties which meet us at the outset, and state candidly what may be thought of them. I would speak of course with great diffidence, feeling moreover that it is an ungracious thing to suggest difficulties, and yet that it would not be acting loyally by Anglicans to ignore their existence. To speak only of the hopes, and say nothing of the difficulties of reunion, would be like inviting people to an aerial tour through the tranquil heavens, with charming prospects of earth and sea and sky above and around, without warning

them that the course of the wind might at any moment bring them up short against the Peak of Teneriffe. I do not say, since 'all things are possible to God,' that such difficulties are insuperable, only that they must be steadily looked in the face.

I. In the first place, then, what are actually the principles of Bossuet, taking him as a fair sample, theologically, of the Gallican school? For these we have not far to go, for they are stated very concisely in Bossuet's well-known work entitled '*Exposition de la Doctrine de l'Eglise Catholique*,' and it may be well to premise, that probably few books have ever received a greater number of approbations, from Bishops, Cardinals, Roman congregations, and from the Pope himself.

Thirty pages of the volume are taken up with these approbations only, including two briefs of Pope Innocent the Eleventh addressed to the author. In these the Pope says: 'We judge the work not only worthy to be praised and approved by us, but also to be read and esteemed by all the world. We hope that this work, by the grace of God, will produce much fruit. We trust that it will be found useful and may aid in propagating the orthodox faith.' In the second Brief it is called 'a wise and pious exposition of the Catholic Faith, and an admirable work.' This will suffice to commend Bossuet's *Exposition of the Faith* to the attention of Anglican readers, as an authorised exposition of Catholic doctrine: most

educated Catholics are of course acquainted with the work. Passing over the chapters on the worship of God, the invocation of Saints, the religious uses of images and relics, on justification and the merits of good works, purgatory, and indulgences, the Real Presence and the Sacrifice of the Mass, let us come to the chapters treating of the Church and its Head. After having spoken of the Holy Ghost, the Spirit of Truth, the author goes on in the next paragraph to speak in order of the Church the visible and perpetual organ and mouth-piece or oracle of the same Holy Spirit. 'It is thus,' he says, 'that the children of God acquiesce in the judgment of the Church, believing that they receive from its mouth the oracle of the Holy Spirit ; therefore it is that after we have said in the Creed, "I believe in the Holy Ghost," we add immediately, "the Holy Catholic Church," whereby we bind ourselves to recognise one truth infallible and perpetual in the Universal Church, since that Church, which we believe has existed in all ages, would have ceased to be the Church if it had ceased to teach the revealed truth of God.' The last chapter of the work is on 'The Authority of the Holy See and of the Episcopate.' 'As the Son of God willed that His Church should be one, and solidly founded on unity, He established and instituted the Primacy of St. Peter in order to maintain and cement this unity. Wherefore we recognise this very Primacy in the successors of the Prince of the Apostles, to

whom, for this reason, we owe that submission and obedience which the Holy Councils and the Holy Fathers have always enjoined on the faithful.

‘As to those points which are known to be disputed by the schools, although often quoted by the reformed ministers, in order to cast odium on the authority of the Holy See, it is unnecessary to allude to them here, as they are not of the Catholic faith. It is sufficient to recognise a Head established by God to conduct the whole Flock in His ways; to this all those who love fraternal concord and ecclesiastical unanimity will readily agree.

‘Certainly if the authors of the pretended Reformation had loved unity, they would not have abolished the episcopal government, which was established by Jesus Christ Himself, and was in full force in the apostolic age, nor would they have despised the authority of St. Peter’s Chair, which has such a sure foundation in the Gospel, and so manifest a sequel in tradition, but rather, they would have carefully preserved the authority of the Episcopate, which maintains unity in particular Churches, and the Primacy of St. Peter’s Chair, which is the common centre of Catholic unity.’

Such is a short exposition of the principles of Bossuet, concerning the Visible Church, which is further developed in the larger works of theologians like De la Hogue, or in the most recent works of Bouvier and others of the same school. The Galli-

cans held the perpetual visibility and infallibility of the Church, that it was One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, and also Roman, because it was a visible, living body, through an essential union with a visible Head, and they taught that the Bishop of Rome was, as successor of Peter, the divinely-appointed Head of the Church, its centre and mouth-piece, apart from whom the Church was not. All this they taught, basing their doctrine on the decrees of the Councils of Florence and of Trent concerning the Supreme Pontiff and his prerogatives in the Church of Christ. Now, are Anglicans prepared to accept this doctrine concerning the Visible Church and its Head? Dr. Pusey, in the name of his school, has already answered in the affirmative, though the statement of these doctrines in his book, and even in his letter, falls short of an acceptance of Bossuet's doctrine. If, however, this is his meaning, the ground has already been laid down authoritatively, and the judgment of the Holy See expressed in a Pontifical Brief, in favour of the soundness of the Gallican principles of Bossuet on the Visible Church and its Head with sufficient clearness to serve as the basis of reunion for any number of individuals, or of Churches.

II. But here comes in the chief difficulty, if, as I fear, there are very few even of advanced Anglicans who would define the Visible Church and its Head with Dr. Pusey, supposing him to accept unreservedly

the principles of Bossuet, which does not seem certain. For the Church cannot recede a single step from the teaching already laid down in the Council of Trent, concerning the Visible Church and its Head ; and the Council of Trent did not, on this point, go beyond what had been already decreed by East and West at the Council of Florence. The words of that Council are as follows :—‘ Moreover we define that the Holy Apostolic See and the Bishop of Rome is successor to the Blessed Peter, Chief of the Apostles, true Vicar of Christ, Head of the whole Church, and Father and Teacher of all Christians ; that to him was given in the person of Blessed Peter the full power to conduct, to rule, and to govern the whole Catholic Church, according to that mode which is determined in the Acts of Œcumenical Councils, and the Holy Canons.’\* It is clear, therefore, that there is no way of conciliating what is commonly called the *branch theory* of the Visible Church with the definitions of Florence and of Trent, or with the opinions of Bossuet and the Gallican school, which were based on these definitions ; and hence, on Gallican principles, the Anglicans have been all along outside the Visible Church. But is there then no possible basis of negotiation for reunion, without a full previous admission on the part of separated bodies that they are out of the Visible Church ? The true reply is, that the history of the Council of

\* Appendix II. Note C.

Florence furnishes an analogy applicable, at least in great part, to the case of the Anglicans. This appears from the learned work on the Oriental Church by Pitzipios, printed in Rome ten years ago at the Propaganda Press. Whatever may be the doctrine of the Greeks at the present day concerning the Visible Church, it seems clear that at the time of the Council of Florence they must have held some such theory as Anglicans now hold ; yet we nowhere find that they were required, either before or after the act of union, to admit that they had been in *formal schism*. The only way of accounting for the mode in which the Oriental Bishops were treated at Ferrara and Florence, is by supposing that the authorities of the Catholic Church laid down and acted on a broad distinction between *material* and *formal* schism. The Patriarch of Constantinople and his train of Bishops, though they were considered by the Pope as actual schismatics, were not treated as rebels. In the great Church of St. George at Ferrara, seats of honour were placed for the Pope and the Western Bishops on the left side of the High Altar, while a similar position to the right of the High Altar was assigned to the Patriarch of Constantinople and the Oriental Bishops, thrones being placed on either side for the Emperor of Germany, who was absent, and the Emperor of Constantinople, while in the midst, on a magnificent throne in front of the Altar, was exposed the Book of the Holy Gospels. The Pope opened

the Sacred Synod by intoning the *Benedictus*, ‘Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, for He hath visited and redeemed His people,’ and all joined together in psalms and canticles. Then was read from the Ambon the invitation to the Council and excommunication of all who should not assent to its decrees ; first on the part of the Patriarch of Constantinople, and afterwards on that of the Pope, declaring the convocation and opening of the Council. This distinction between material and formal schism may also account for the fact, that the Greeks were not required to repudiate the Saints of their Communion, who had been canonized during the Schism.\* In the same way in the great Western Schism of the Anti-Popes, there were Saints of both obediences, and yet it is certain that there was only one true Pope, and therefore the adherents of one side or the other were at least in material schism. Of course, the case of the Anti-Popes is only an analogy, as far as it goes ; and so also is the case of the Council of Florence. Neither can be said to cover the case of the Anglicans, if for no other reason, because the orders of the Oriental Church were universally recognised ; while those of Anglicans, up to this moment, have never been admitted amongst ourselves. Nevertheless, it is clear that the mode in which the Oriental Bishops were treated was not simply owing

\* Appendix II. Note D, quoting Palmer’s *Orthodox Communion*.



to the respect due to their orders, which would not make them a whit less schismatical, but was based on the broad and solid distinction between material and formal schism. And this principle would hold good with certain differences, if any body of baptized Christians, such as the Lutherans of Germany, or the Presbyterians of Scotland, should make advances for negotiations with the Catholic Church, with a view to admission into visible unity. For argument's sake, and to prevent any confusion of the real question with that of Anglican orders (on which I do not intend to enter), let us consider the case of Anglicans in respect of material or formal schism on no higher grounds, and try to judge of their relation to the Church and the relation of the Church to them from this point only; as if, for instance, it were the case of the Lutherans formerly, debated between Bossuet and Leibnitz. We are still brought to the conclusion that admission of fundamental error need not necessarily be required of separated bodies, as a previous condition of negotiations for reunion or submission.

III. But suppose that not only Dr. Pusey, but a large body who are willing to be represented by him, are prepared for *bonâ fide* negotiations for reunion on the principles of Bossuet, and that the authorities of the Catholic Church have formally accepted negotiations on this basis; here occurs a difficulty, so great as to be almost overwhelming.

Dr. Pusey represents, as yet, only a school of opinion. Not one English Bishop has publicly identified himself with this school, and few of the Anglican Bishops ever lose an opportunity of publishing their energetic dissent from many of the doctrines which he and those who think with him hold as integral portions of the Faith. Let me refer to a remarkable Anglican sermon which states this same difficulty far better than I can, whilst it offers some solution of it.\* The author quotes from the *Christian Remembrancer*: ‘Within the English Church there exists a large school, who look upon the desire to unite with Rome in any form as sinful, and who must *pari passu* be conciliated, unless the unity of Christendom is to determine the break-up of the Church of England.’ The writer of the sermon comments thus on the words quoted: ‘We have no desire to make light of this very serious consideration, and no honest discussion of our present subject can escape its force and urgency. There are, it may be, some among us who would make short work with it. They would regard the expulsion of the so-termed Evangelicals from the Church as a blessing only inferior to the reunion of Catholic-minded Churchmen with the Latin and Greek communions. We cannot agree with them in this judgment. . . . But no one who is really acquainted with the actual tone and

\* Sermon signed ‘L.’ in Second Series of *Sermons on Reunion of Christendom*. London: Hayes.

working of the Church of England can deny that the "Evangelical" clergy, on the whole, are steadily advancing towards a higher measure of truth than they had attained in past years. "Evangelicalism," indeed, is as the womb of Rebecca : it contains a Jacob and an Esau. To some souls its attraction lies in the fact that it rationalistically ignores or denies Sacramental Truth. To others, a fundamentally different class of minds, its charm consists in that love of, and devotion to, the Person of our Blessed Redeemer which has undeniably characterised its general history. And as those who are attracted by its negative aspects are continually sinking, and become, as opportunity arises, the easy prey of Rationalism ; so those who are drawn by its positive Faith and Love are, under the guidance of the Blessed Spirit, as perpetually rising, and they furnish its best recruits to the cause of Catholicism. Indeed, the advance of Rationalism, fraught as it is with the utmost danger to the salvation of many precious souls, does incidentally help to reduce, as in the long run it may probably destroy altogether, the difficulty before us. It acts as a solvent upon the popular Evangelicalism. It precipitates the anti-sacramental negative element towards the pure Rationalism with which, under the common name of Free Thought, it has the strongest and most radical affinities. It drives the adoring and believing element upward, to take shelter from its devastating and its unspiritual action in a sincere allegiance to the principle of Church

authority. This disintegration of Evangelicalism is going on rapidly beneath our eyes, and every attack upon the books of Holy Scripture, nay more, every serious inquiry into the historical origin and authority of the Sacred Canon, is a certain, although unnoticed, step in its gradual progress. And we rejoice to believe that while, alas, only too many in that great party are day by day forfeiting, at the bidding of Rationalistic principles, the light and warmth which has heretofore streamed upon their souls from the Sun of Righteousness, the great majority are truer to the loftier instincts of their spiritual nature than to the logical exigencies of their theory, and are moving, amid whatever defections and relapses, towards the full acceptance of the Faith.

‘If this be so, we may trust that in the kindly Providence of our gracious Lord the restored unity of Christendom, if it be granted to us, will not determine in the break-up of the Church of England. It may coincide, in point of time, with the final retirement from our communion of those who bend in reality before no Truth whatever, as revealed and certain; and to whom the language of the Prayer Book, from the daily Morning Absolution down to the Visitation of the Sick, is, when they steadily reflect upon its import, a standing cause of offence. But among these, too, there are generous souls; and God may have for them and for us a future in store of which we cannot yet discern the bearings. Enough,

at any rate, has been said to show that, short of active conciliation of the "Evangelical" party—a most sacred duty, be it remarked, so far as loyalty to truth permits—there are causes at work which may re-assure us, when we consider the very formidable objection to any practical scheme for reunion among Catholic Christians of the Greek, and Roman, and Anglican Churches, the objection which is based on the position and numbers of the "Evangelical" party in the latter communion.' Having spoken of the causes which he sees in operation amongst the various sections of his own Church, in which he thinks he discerns afar off the principles of unity and truth working themselves to order out of chaos, he speaks also of the relations in which his Church stands 'to the great Churches of Christendom.' 'It would be at once disingenuous and unpractical to ignore the fact that the "secondary matters" which divide the great Churches of Christendom are of graver import than any question of Liturgical form.

'More points of difference might be named—some of them serious ones. But our present purpose is not to enumerate, still less to exaggerate them. It is our duty to recognise them. There they are, patent and painful facts; nor will any scheme of reunion have a chance of success which postulates simple submission from one side, and claims Œcumenicity for the other. The questions which divide the

Churches must be regarded, *pro tanto*, as open questions; "open," that is, not absolutely, but to the revision of an Œcumenical Council, when such may be had. And if any should say or think that to anticipate the assembling of such a representation of Christendom in our own day is a visionary imagination; or that, if assembled, it could ever introduce the reign of harmony into the realms of ecclesiastical discord, let us reflect that God has taught His people their deepest lessons by the pressure of suffering inflicted from without. None can mark the upgrowth and power of the infidel spirit in Europe, without seeing that we are drifting rapidly towards a time more like that of the first three centuries of the Church's life than any subsequent period has been. The religion of Jesus Christ has experienced in turn all the relations towards the worldly power which are abstractedly possible. It has survived persecution; it has survived, more marvellously still, ages of wealth and power; it has lived on under a cold neutrality; and it might seem as if the cycle thus completed might, ere long, begin over again. In the infidel literature of Europe, there are ominous threats and undisguised passions, which remind us that the spirit which cried of old, "*Christianos ad leones*," is not extinct. That spirit will re-appear in England with those fuller developments of Rationalism, which are apparently inevitable, and we may hope that suffering in a com-

mon cause, if such be the will of our Divine Lord, will teach those who should be brothers to understand each other. Meanwhile, existing differences may be lawfully minimized; and, even if we do not see our way in the tangled maze towards a practical solution of the difficulties which they undeniably present, we may cultivate a habit of hopeful, peaceful, trustful expectancy, relying firmly on the revealed will of our Divine Lord, and looking forward to the time "when Ephraim shall not envy Judah, and Judah shall not vex Ephraim." To recognise difficulties is one thing, to despair of overcoming them is another.'

None will fail to observe the grasp of his subject and the masterly treatment of the difficulty by this writer, nor does it need the initial letter of his name to indicate to us perhaps the most leading mind and greatest preacher that Oxford has produced since the days of Dr. Newman, and one who is likely to do more than any other man towards forming the mind of the University in its younger members.

IV. And here it seems natural to refer to another great difficulty which may be said to underlie the question of individual responsibility, and of individual submission. It is obvious that 'the disintegration of the Low Church section of Anglicans,' spoken of by the author of the Sermon just quoted, can only be the work of time; difficulties and delays may obstruct the project of a General Council, to whose decision

the various sections of Anglicans might agree to submit their differences with one another, and their differences with the Catholic Church. Meantime, the national Church, as a body, can make no advances which could be accepted by the Catholic Authorities, or even by the Oriental or Russian Communion, because it can have no authoritative voice, or common principle, or moral personality ; there would be no one to treat or to be treated with. It must continue a heterogeneous body, so long as it does not put from it one of the two great schools which have always held divided sway. How then, meantime, will the Catholic School in the Anglican Church, supposing it to be able legally to hold its ground, be able to do so conscientiously, should its members have advanced so far individually as to be ready to seek for corporate reunion on the principles of Bossuet and the Gallican divines ?

Those divines admit, with the Council of Florence, a dogma on the nature of the visible Church which cannot be reconciled with the Anglican *branch* theory. This theory therefore and that dogma cannot stand together ; and obvious as is the distinction between material and formal schism, yet it is no less obvious that material schism becomes formal, when consciousness of the fact of schism begins. Human events may defer indefinitely projects of corporate reunion, but truth, when we know it, rests on us with an eternal obligation, independent



of all conceivable circumstances and events. *Fiat justitia, ruat cælum.* If then the truth be once made clear to us, what voice upon earth can dare to say, 'Stay and work for unity,' when the voice of illuminated conscience says, 'Go and follow out the exigence of truth?' It was on this principle that Newman and Manning quitted years ago a vantage ground, which no one has since occupied. Far be it from us to judge any man. Each several soul before his own Master standeth or falleth. And, as regards the case of individuals, we never know where to set limits to the possibility of invincible ignorance and material schism; still it would not be right to have concluded without guarding against the possibility of leaving a single soul to suppose that anything could justify the sacrifice of the *justum* to the *utile*, of *truth* to *expediency*, even though that expediency might seem to be to 'the greater glory of God.' We know not whether this present Catholic movement in the Anglican Church may have any immediate issue other than that of the former movement twenty years ago. Yet we may all pray heartily that its ultimate result may be a great corporate reunion of the National Church with the ancient Mother and Mistress of all the Churches. Or if this be not in the designs of God—and perhaps we are all too weak in faith, in charity, and in prayer to obtain so great a grace—we cannot doubt that it will issue in important results; perhaps at first like

the former movement, only in the submission as individuals of many precious souls ; perhaps in something of which we seem to discover not a few indications, a movement of all that is truest and noblest in Anglicanism in the direction of a *Free Church*, independent of State control. Should this turn out to be the more immediate issue, such an event might be hailed, as the sure precursor of a very speedy act on the part of such seceding body, of corporate submission to the Divine authority of the Visible Church and of Christ's Vicar upon earth. If Anglicanism were liberated from State control, the Catholic element being set free would fly as it were of its own nature to the Centre of Unity.

Then, if ever, would be the time when a large seceding body, such as might not unfitly be termed a free Church of England, might be in a position to make such propositions on submission to the Catholic Church as its members might agree upon and deem expedient. We can conceive that it might ask, and the Roman authorities might grant, various explanations on points of doctrine, or concessions on points of discipline, if it could be shown that by so doing some of those difficulties might be removed or lessened which are presented by the aspect of the Catholic religion, viewed from without, to a nation which, like the English, has been separated by a chasm of three centuries from the traditions of Catholic Christendom. And so perhaps

the way might be made more plain for the return of England, as a nation, to the Ancient Faith.

But if, as is quite possible, neither of these great movements should take place in our day, though we need not at present contemplate such an alternative, may our Lord continue the good work which He has begun, in His own time, and in His own way ; and may we cultivate amongst ourselves, and towards those without, a great spirit of charity and forbearance—that charity which hopeth all things—that so all our prayers and good works may ascend ‘like incense before God,’ in never-ceasing intercession for the peace and unity of our Jerusalem, for the conversion of pagans, infidels, and sinners, and for the reunion\* of all the Baptized who have once been

\* The following passages encourage the hope that we may before long see inaugurated by the Catholic Bishops, or with their sanction, a great ‘Association of prayer for the Unity of Christendom,’ which, it would seem, the Bishop of Mayence would energetically invite all those who believe in Christ to join. He writes : ‘How different is the present aspect of Christendom from that Jesus Christ prayed for, “that they may be one, even as We are One.” It is our duty to strive to the very utmost to restore this union. No Catholic, however small his power, should refuse his help. The humblest materials are employed in the greatest buildings. But there are two chief means which, in my opinion, we can all use. The first is to pray for the reunion of all Christian confessions. Would that this unanimous prayer could be organised on a common plan, accepted by all Christian souls who long for the reunion of the various religious societies! . . . What would still more rejoice us would be to see men of different Christian communions deliberate together for organising the

made members of the Mystical Body of Christ to the visible communion of the world-wide Catholic Church!

recital of some common prayer by all who believe that Jesus Christ is the true and only Son of God. I cannot think that God could refuse to hear such a prayer, that we should for the future form but one body, *ut omnes unum sint.*'—From the work by Dr. Ketteler, Bishop of Mayence, entitled *Liberté, Autorité, Église*, p. 227.

## APPENDIX I.

---

### *Letter of Dr. Newman to the 'Weekly Register.'*

SIR,—I beg leave to call your attention to a passage in your admirable Review last week of Dr. Pusey's recent work. It is there asserted by implication that 'the statement that the Church of England is, in God's hands, the great bulwark against infidelity in this land,' was 'originally enunciated by Dr. Newman.'

I have written in my lifetime a great deal more than I can remember, but I neither know where I have made this particular statement, nor can I conceive I ever made it, whether in print, in private letter, or in conversation. And I am sure I should not have made it deliberately. Certainly, it does not express my real judgment concerning the Church of England. Nor have I any reason to think that Dr. Pusey ascribes it to me.

What I said in my *Apologia* was this: 'Doubtless the National Church has hitherto been a serviceable breakwater against doctrinal errors more fundamental than its own.'

The words 'serviceable' and 'breakwater' both convey the idea of something accidental and *de facto*; whereas a bulwark is an essential part of the thing defended. Moreover, in saying 'against doctrinal errors more fundamental than its own,' I simply meant that, while it happens to serve Catholic truth in one respect,

nevertheless in another it has doctrinal errors, and those fundamental.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

The Oratory, Birmingham : Nov. 19, 1865.

---

*Letter of Dr. Pusey to the 'Weekly Register.'*

SIR,—I thank you with all my heart for your kind-hearted and appreciative view of my 'Eirenicon.' I am thankful that you have brought out the main drift and object of it, what, in my mind, underlies the whole, to show that, in my conviction, there is no insurmountable obstacle to the union of (you will forgive the terms, though you must reject them) the Roman, Greek, and Anglican communions. I have long been convinced that there is nothing in the Council of Trent which could not be explained satisfactorily to us, if it were explained *authoritatively*, i. e. by the Roman Church itself, not by individual theologians only. This involves the conviction on my side, that there is nothing in our Articles which cannot be explained rightly, as not contradicting anything held to be *de fide* in the Roman Church. The great body of the faith is held alike by both; on those subjects referred to in our Art. XXII., I believe (to use the language of a very eminent Italian nobleman) 'your [our] *maximum* and our [your] *minimum* might be found to harmonise.

In regard to details of explanation, it was not my office, as being a Priest only, invested with no authority, to draw them out. But I wished to indicate their possibility. You are relatively under the same circumstances. But I believe that the hope which you have held out, that

the authorities in the Roman communion *might* hold that 'a reunion on the principles of Bossuet would be better than a perpetuated schism,' will unlock many a pent-up longing, pent-up on the ground of apparent hopelessness, that Rome would accord to the English Church any terms which it could accept.

May I add, that nothing was further from my wish than to write anything which should be painful to those in your Communion? A defence, indeed, of necessity involves some blame; since, in a quarrel, the blame must be wholly on the one side or on the other, or divided; and a defence implies that it is not wholly on the side defended. But having smoothed down, as I believe, honestly every difficulty I could, to my own people, I thought that it would not be right towards them, not to state, where I conceive the real difficulty to lie. Nor could your authorities meet our difficulties, unless they knew them. You will think it superfluous, that I desired that none of this system, which is now matter of 'pious opinion,' should, like the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, be made *defide*. But in the view of a hoped-for reunion, everything which you do affects us. Let me say, too, that I did not write as a reformer, but on the defensive. It is not for us to prescribe to Italians or Spaniards, what they shall hold, or how they shall express their pious opinions. All which we wish is to have it made certain by authority, that we should not, in case of reunion, be obliged to hold them ourselves. Least of all did I think of imputing to any of the writers, whom I quoted, that they 'took from our Lord any of the love which they gave to His Mother.' I was intent only on describing the system which I believe is the great obstacle to reunion. I had not the least thought of criticising holy men who held it.

As it is of moment, that I should not be misunder-

stood by my own people, let me add, that I have not intended to express any opinion about a visible head of the Church. We readily recognise the Primacy of the Bishop of Rome; the bearings of that Primacy upon other local Churches, we believe to be matter of ecclesiastical, not of Divine law; but neither is there anything in the Supremacy in itself to which we should object. Our only fear is, that it should, through the appointment of our Bishops, involve the reception of that practical *quasi*-authoritative system, which is, I believe, alike the cause, and (forgive me) the justification in our eyes of our remaining apart.

But although I intended to be on the defensive, I thank you most warmly for that tenderness, which enabled you to see my aim and objects throughout a long and necessarily miscellaneous work. And I believe that the way in which you have treated this our *bonâ fide* 'endeavour to find a basis for reunion on the principles debated between Archbishop Wake and the Gallican Divines two centuries ago,' will, by rekindling hope, give a strong impulse towards that reunion. Despair is still. If hope is revived in the English mind, that Christendom may again be united, rekindled hope will ascend in more fervent prayer to Him who 'maketh men to be of one mind in a house,' and our prayers will not return unheard for want of love.

Your obedient servant,

E. B. PUSEY.

Christ Church: Nov. 22, 1865.

---

*Second Letter of Dr. Pusey to the 'Weekly Register.'*

SIR,—Will you allow me a few words in explanation, in consequence of Canon Oakeley's remarks on my letter to



you, which breathe the kindness of never-forgotten years, but in which, perhaps on that very account, he has read my meaning rather in the light of his own wishes for me?

1. In regard to the Council of Trent, my statement was, 'I have long been convinced that there is nothing in the Council of Trent which *could* not be explained satisfactorily to us, if it were explained authoritatively.'

I meant by this, that in regard to some of the declarations of the Council of Trent, which, unexplained, present difficulties to us, some of your own theologians, who have spoken with authority, especially in later times, have stated that certain beliefs are sufficient to satisfy the meaning of the Council on these subjects. If the Church of Rome could formally declare that those beliefs were alone *de fide*, I believe that the great difficulty to reunion on our side would be removed. I could not call this 'holding all Roman doctrine;' for this would, in my mind, involve (1) holding the doctrine in the way in which it is commonly and popularly held among you, whether *de fide* or no; (2) holding the doctrine on the authority of Rome, which, not being a member of the Roman Communion, I, of course, do not. Rather, it is holding a faith, which I received (at a time when we never read a Roman book), through writers of our Church, from early tradition, as expounding authoritatively Holy Scripture. On comparing my belief with that expressed by the Council of Trent, I thought that its terms, as explained by some individual doctors, yet of authority among you, did not condemn what I believed, and did not require me to believe what I did not believe. I thought that the Council of Trent so explained for the Church of England, might be a basis of union. If I may sum up briefly, I think that not only on the whole range of doctrine, on the Holy Trinity, and the Incarnation, but also on Original

Sin and Justification, and all the doctrines of Grace, there is nothing to be explained ; that on the Canon of Scripture, the Holy Eucharist, and the anointing of the sick, there is what has to be mutually explained ; that on what I suppose you will account points of lesser magnitude, as those alluded to in our XXII. Article, there will be need not only of explanation, but of limitation, what is to be *de fide*.

2. In regard to the Supremacy of the Pope, I do not know what it involves, nor am I aware that its limits have been laid down among you. The Council of Florence, at least according to the Greek copies, in Archbishop De Marca's words (De Conc. Sacred et Imp. iii. 8 fin.), declared that 'the privileges of the Pope are to be explained and exercised according to the Canons and according to the Acts of Œcumenical Councils, i.e. of the eight Councils, which consisted of the Western and Eastern Church.' But this would leave much to be defined. I conclude, however, that the Roman Church cannot hold the Supremacy to be *de fide*, since it has ever called the Greeks, who reject it, schismatics, not heretics. In what I wrote I was thinking of a practical question (as we English do), what, in the case of a reunion, would be its effects upon us. You must, anyhow, think the application of the Supremacy to vary in different times, since you must believe, that whatever it be or in whatever it consist, it does not necessarily involve either (1) the appointment of the Bishops of a Church in communion with the See of Rome, by the Pope, nor (2) that the sanction of the Roman Court must be had, in order to the *validity* of its Canons, within itself, nor (3) suppose that *all* appeals should be carried to Rome. For the two first were unknown to the Church in St. Augustine's time; and the third, the African Bishops in Council refused. And I

meant that what we English, as a practical nation, should feel, would be not an abstract relation in itself (which might be modified by Concordats, and would probably, in Henry VIII.'s time, had that been a time of Concordats), but such authority as would, by the appointment of our teachers, soon bring in that whole practical system, which is the ground of our remaining as we are.

I have ventured to address this line to you, because I believe, full explicitness and openness is essential to all attempts at a better mutual understanding. Difficulties there are, like mountains; but the prayer of faith can remove mountains; and He, whose coming in the Flesh we now rejoice in, with the same devotion, can bid 'every valley be exalted, and every mountain and hill to be made low, and the crooked places to become straight, and the rough places plain, that the glory of God may be revealed, and all flesh see it together.'

Your obedient servant,

E. B. PUSEY.

Christ Church, Oxford: Dec. 6, 1865.

---

## APPENDIX II.

---

I have to thank a learned friend for the substance of some of the following notes:—

NOTE A.—When St. Athanasius returned from exile, A.D. 362, he was joined by Eusebius, of Vercelli, who had likewise been exiled, together with Lucifer of Cagliari, on account of the Orthodox Faith. Lucifer, on his return

from exile, went to Antioch, and there ordained Paulinus Bishop of that See, Meletius having been previously elected Bishop, as we have seen, by the votes of the Arians, though he himself had declared for the Catholic Faith. Lucifer despatches two of his Deacons, and two more from Paulinus, to the Synod, then being held at Alexandria by St. Athanasius, at which Eusebius was likewise present. Thus Paulinus became immediately identified with the orthodox party. From that Synod Eusebius went direct to Antioch, when he found the Church divided into two parties; for the followers of Meletius still adhered to him, and communicated in the Mother-Church in the old part of the city. Meletius himself had actually been banished by the Arians for having abjured their creed, and he returned just as Eusebius arrived. Eusebius, finding things in this state, could not be brought to approve the manner in which Paulinus had been consecrated by Lucifer, though at the same time he had, with the Alexandrian Synod, approved of that act, ignorant of the merits of the case. After fruitless efforts to reconcile the parties, he left for Italy, refusing to communicate with either side. Eusebius, therefore, going back into the West, would naturally report how things really stood. Lucifer, on the other hand, irritated with his conduct, was even disposed to quarrel with the Synod of Alexandria, and went home to Sardinia, where he died the following year, being the founder of a sect called after him, which made a schism in the Church. We have, therefore, these two facts. Paulinus had been consecrated by Lucifer, but his consecration had been blamed by Eusebius, the acknowledged leader of the Orthodox party, who took the news into the West. His consecrator, on his return to the West, immediately afterwards becomes the founder of a sect, and dies in schism.

All this must have prejudiced Paulinus in the eyes of the West. On the other hand, Meletius, though elected by the Arian party, had afterwards been banished by them for his profession of orthodoxy; and this fact, likewise, Eusebius, who had met him at Antioch on his return from exile, would naturally report to the West. Thus, Meletius would be going up in opinion; and, just in proportion, Paulinus would be going down. The balance would be still more in favour of Meletius, when he was called upon by an Emperor of the known orthodoxy of Theodosius to preside at the Second General Council. Thus there had been a virtual suspension of Communion on the part of the West, not only in respect of Meletius, but also of Paulinus; yet the cause of Meletius was gaining ground. It is clearly an anomalous case, which must not be judged by modern precedents, and cannot be relied on in proof of any system, since important links are probably wanting, and so much has to be made up by inference.

NOTE B.—The prayers for the conversion of England were, we believe, established at Oscott at the time when the late Cardinal, then Bishop Wiseman, was President of the College; and we believe they are still in use there, and in many other places, and by many individuals. In the celebrated letter of Cardinal Wiseman to Lord Shrewsbury, the idea of corporate reunion is entertained throughout. After speaking in terms of great hopefulness of the prayers for unity which had lately been established amongst Anglicans, he continues: ‘That the feelings which have been expressed in favour of unity in the Anglican Church are every day widely spreading and deeply sinking, no one who has the means of judging, I think, can doubt.’ Again, he considers this movement ‘as an approximation not merely towards individual Catholic practices or doctrines, but towards Catholic union.’ But the letter is

so important in its bearing on the present movement that it should be read by all.

NOTE C.—Since my review of Dr. Pusey's book was in type, my attention has been called to the fact that on a clause in the Council of Florence of which I have given there a version, a controversy is at this moment on foot between two writers who translate the passage differently. As I make no pretence to accurate Greek scholarship, I feel incompetent to pronounce; but as these two writers disagree, it may be well to give both their translations, leaving those of my readers who are Greek scholars to select which of the versions they think the truest.

A writer in the 'Dublin Review' translates this clause 'as is the accepted doctrine in the acts of Councils and in the Holy Canons.'

Another writer, in a letter to the 'Union,' has translated it, in close accordance with myself, 'in the way determined both in the acts of the Œcumenical Councils and in the Holy Canons.' In the Greek original, the controverted clause is *καθ' ὃν τρόπον . . . διαλαμβάνεται*. The Latin version, said to have been made 150 years after the Council, is 'Quemadmodum etiam in gestis Œcumenicorum conciliorum et in sacris canonibus continetur.'

The writer in the 'Dublin' blames the translation of the word *διαλαμβάνεται*; he says: 'Who ever heard of this word as signifying "determined, appointed, prescribed"? It signifies, of course, "received," "accepted."'

The other writer replies: 'Among the ordinary senses of the word, I find in Stephens, "comprehendo, constituo, statuo, censeo, dijudico, expono, tracto;" which Hederic and Scapula repeat almost in the same words, and which Liddell and Scott translate, "to grasp with both hands, to weigh, debate, and so determine, to resolve, to set out or state clearly and distinctly;" neither Suicer nor Du Fresne

notice any senses of that verb peculiar to the middle ages. No lexicon that I am aware of has rendered it by the Latin "contineo," or "contineo" by the English, accept.'

NOTE D.—Mr. Palmer's words are: 'According to the terms of the Council of Florence, the Greeks would have continued to honour all their Saints who had lived since the separation.' Mr. Palmer does not give references, but we presume that so learned and careful a writer may be depended on as an authority; however, we learn from the Bullarium of Benedict XIV. that the rituals of the Greeks and their menæa or martyrology containing the offices of their Saints, were allowed to be retained by them at the reunion effected at the Council of Florence.

LONDON

PRINTED BY SPOTTISWOODE AND CO.

NEW-STREET SQUARE







